DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 436 819 EA 030 145

AUTHOR	Townsend, Tony
TITLE	From Second to Third Millennium Schools: The Impact of the Reform Agenda on School Development.
PUB DATE	1999-04-00
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; Educational History; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Global Approach

ABSTRACT

This paper draws on studies from around the world to examine the impact of school reform over the last 30 years. It claims that there is little or no evidence that recent education reforms necessarily lead to improved student outcomes for all students. In fact, findings indicate that some reforms promote a rapid increase in the variation in student achievement between the best- and worst-achieving students and that this variation is linked to the level of decentralization within the school system. The article states that reform activity over the past few years, together with other social changes involving technology, the economy, and employment, have led to new ways of thinking about education. The paper charts the educational changes coming in the third millennium and suggests that dominant trends in society, such as technology, a global economy, and electronic communications, will foster the move from a national to an international or global focus. The report advocates a new charter for education that is oriented towards global education. It suggests that schools use technology rather than compete with it, that they develop collaborative learning, that they refocus on the individual, and that they highlight process skills rather than specific content knowledge. (Contains 44 references.) (RJM)

From Second to Third Millennium Schools: The Impact of the Reform Agenda on School Development

Assoc. Professor Tony Townsend,
Monash University, Australia

A paper presented as part of the International Symposium,
Issues in School Effectiveness Research
AERA, 1999
Montreal, Canada

For further information, contact:
Associate Professor Tony Townsend
Faculty of Education, Monash University,
PO Box 527, Frankston, 3199,
Victoria, Australia.
Telephone: 61-3-9904-4230
Facsimile: 61-3-9904-4237
Email: tony.townsend@education.monash.edu.au

Where we are now

In recent times education systems around the world have recognised the need for schools to change the way in which they went about their task. If we look at human history, it will not take us long to discover at least two things have been the dominant shapers of recent society.

First, human progress never seems to stop and it seems to be happening at an ever-increasing rate. Perhaps the most interesting fact about Alvin Toffler's (1971) book *Future Shock*, is that it is now nearly thirty years old. Two generations of students have passed through school since the book was written, yet it could be argued that we have done little to address the issues that Toffler identified. Technology might be seen as having a positive influence in the sense that it enables many services to be delivered cheaply and efficiently, but it can also be seen as having a negative effect in the sense that it has dislocated many workers whose jobs were replaced because of that technology. This 'good news-bad news' factor is perhaps best characterised by the rapidly approaching Third Millennium, where not only will increasing advances in technology lead us to the development of the information age, virtual schools and, possibly, virtual everything else, but it has also brought with it the potential seeds of destruction with the unknowns surrounding the Millennium Bug.

Second, the emerging globalisation of the economy has changed the way in which we think about ourselves and the world. It is no longer possible to shelter a particular country from the international marketplace. The economic, environmental or political decisions made in one country affect many others in turn. This could be seen as a positive influence in that it has opened up new markets, previously unattainable, and has generally lowered the prices of services and goods to consumers, but can also be seen as having a negative influence because of the potential for leading to what Martin and Schumann (1997) call a '20:80 society'. Here, '20 per cent of the population will suffice to keep the world economy going and the unemployed 80 per cent will be pacified by a diet of 'tittytainment' - ie. the modern equivalent of bread and circuses but without nearly so much bread'.

Other factors have had a more specific impact on recent developments in education. Brian Caldwell, a leading proponent of devolution, argued:

> Forces which have shaped current and emerging patterns of school management include a concern for efficiency in the management of public education, effects of the recession and financial crisis, complexity in the provision of education, empowerment of teachers and parents, the need for flexibility and responsiveness, the search for school effectiveness and school improvement, interest in choice and market forces in schooling, the politics of education, the establishment of new frameworks for industrial relations and the emergence of a national imperative.
>
> Caldwell (1993: xiii)

In many countries of the world education reform has taken place, with the most dominant feature being the move towards more responsibility and decision-making at the level of the individual school, which is perhaps best characterised as the self-managing school. In countries as diverse as the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, South Africa, Malaysia, Hong Kong and Australia, among others, this single form of restructuring education has emerged to change the face of the way in which governments deliver public education. Perhaps the key argument for this form of restructuring has been its potential to impact on student learning. This is typified by the stated rationale for the Victorian *Schools of the Future*, which is a 'commitment to the view that quality outcomes of schooling can only be assured when decision-making takes place at the local level' (Directorate of School Education, 1993: 1).

The progress so far

It needs to be said that, so far, there is little or no evidence, anywhere in the world that indicates that many of the education reforms recently undertaken necessarily lead to improved student outcomes for all students. At best we might argue that some schools and some students have profited from the changes but that others are in the same place or are even worse off than they were before the reforms were implemented. Codding (1997: 15) argued:

> ...almost none of the widely advocated reforms - modular scheduling, open space, individualized instruction, different school governance experiments, vouchers, charter schools, the various curriculum reform initiatives - have survived or changed student performance.

Evidence is starting to emerge that, for some of the reforms there is a rapid increase in the variation in student achievement between the best and worst achieving students, and that this variation is, in some way, linked to the level of decentralisation occurring within the school system (MacBeath, 1999).

Research on this lack of necessary connection between self-management and student outcomes comes from many countries. In the USA, Malen, Ogawa and Kranz (1990) undertook a meta-analysis of educational reform in the 1980s and found little or no impact on student achievement. More recently, Elmore (1993: 44) argued:

> [T]here is little or no evidence that [site-based management] has any direct or predictable relationship to changes in instruction and students' learning. In fact, the evidence suggests that the implementation of site-based management reforms has a more or less random relationship to changes in curriculum, teaching, and students' learning.

A meta-analysis of 70 studies (Summers and Johnson (1996: 80) found that 'there is little evidence to support the notion that SBM is effective in increasing student performance.

There are very few quantitative studies, the studies are not statistically rigorous, and the evidence of positive results is either weak or non-existent'.

Other studies (Olson, 1997; Bryk, 1998) have focused on work being done in Chicago. However the results here are somewhat ambiguous. Bryk reported on a number of schools that were given self-management status as a means of overcoming their poor performance. At a symposium at the 1998 AERA, Bryk indicated an innovative way of measuring the value added by schools. A number of schools had improved their performance, but others had fallen further behind. As Olson suggested (1997: 30) 'decentralisation creates the conditions that allow schools to improve one at a time.'

Perhaps the most useful research emerging from the US is that being undertaken by Phillips (1997) in Philadelphia, where the structural reorganisation of schools into clusters and the use of rewards, assistance and consequences at the school level seem to have led to significant improvement in reading, mathematics and science test scores, and Newmann and Wehlage (1995: 3) who, after examining schools across the United States, described the structures for improvement as follows:

> The most successful schools were those that used restructuring tools to help them function as professional communities. That is, they found a way to channel staff and student efforts toward a clear, commonly shared purpose for student learning, they created opportunities for teachers to collaborate and help one another achieve the purpose; and teachers in these schools took collective - not just individual - responsibility for student learning. Schools with strong professional communities were better able to offer authentic pedagogy and were more effective in promoting student achievement.

In Britain, Bullock and Thomas, in their study of school self-management, (1997: 217-219) concluded:

> It may be that the most convincing evidence of the impact of local management is on the opportunities which it has provided for managing the environment and resources for learning, both factors that can act to support the quality of learning in schools. What remains elusive, however, is clear-cut evidence of these leading though to direct benefits on learning, an essential component if we are to conclude that it is contributing to higher levels of efficiency...
>
> ...If learning is at the heart of education, it must be central to our final discussion of decentralisation...
>
> ...we must begin by recognising that structural changes in governance, management and finance may leave largely untouched the daily interaction of pupils and teachers.

Other British critics of self-management, such as Whitty (1994), suggest that the local management changes in the United Kingdom have not altered children's learning in the positive way that might have been expected. 34% of head teachers in a study conducted by Arnott *et al* (1992) thought there had been an improvement in children's learning, 31% a regression and 35% were unsure, results that largely support those of Bullock and Thomas (1994). Arnott *et al* concede that, although the study is broadly positive, 'direct evidence of the influence of self-management on learning is elusive' (from Whitty, 1994: 5).

In New Zealand, the early pioneering studies of Ramsay and his colleagues (1983), found that the influence of the school one attended, and family and social background were significant determinants when it came to student outcomes. Lauder and Hughes (1990) found that for low school achievers the kind of school attended made relatively little difference to subsequent performance. However, they also found that high achieving pupils from high socio-economic status schools had a considerable advantage over high achieving students from low socio-economic status schools.

Thrupp (1996; 1997) identified a group of working class students, whom he termed 'ordinary kids' and used multiple data sources to gain a view of the processes to which these ordinary kids were being exposed. He concluded (1996: 386) that his study provided a detailed picture of 'how middle class families wittingly or unwittingly gain advantage in education by educating their children in segregated, and therefore inherently unequal schools. In doing so [the study] provides further evidence for the market as a class strategy.'

Wylie's work has shown (1997: v-vi) that the reform activity in New Zealand, like most other places, has resulted in concerns about increased workloads, lack of staffing, decreased government resources coupled with an increased responsibility for parents to raise funds locally. Sixty-two per cent of principals but only 39% of teachers felt that the changes have impacted positively on the quality of student learning. She concluded (Wylie 1997: 178) 'many principals and teachers do see positive gains for children. The reforms have been less successful in improving educational opportunities for children from disadvantaged groups...resource gaps remain evident, particularly for schools serving low income and/or Maori children'.

> Internationally, New Zealand has moved from being a nation with one of the best literacy rates to one that has the greatest gap between its advantaged and disadvantaged students in a very short time (Colvin, 1997: 11).

> Reading has been a source of national pride since 1970, when New Zealand students finished first in an international test...The 1991 survey by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement found that many children - especially Maoris and other minorities did poorly. New Zealand had the largest gap between majority and minority children of any participating country.

Perhaps the most useful and recent work that considers the impact of self-managing schools on student learning from an Australian perspective comes from Caldwell (1998). After a thorough survey of self-management internationally, he concludes (Caldwell, 1998: 38):

> There is no doubt that, while factors underpinning the movement to self-managing schools are many and varied, there has always been an expectation that they will make a contribution to improved outcomes for students. There is also no doubt that evidence of a direct cause-and-effect relationship between self-management and improved outcomes is minimal.

While Caldwell goes on to argue that there is an indirect effect realised 'through action in the personnel and professional domain, and also in the curriculum domain, (Caldwell, 1998: 17) there is little hard data to support such a claim.

One feature of school reform internationally is that, when a reform measure is introduced (almost regardless of the reform) not all schools are improved. If we focus our attention and resources on some schools, they will improve, but if we try to improve all schools at once, only some will succeed, as Hill and Crevola (1997: 2) point out:

> Improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools is not an easy matter. There have been many attempts to raise standards by one means of another, but reformers have invariably found that it is difficult to improve learning in a sustained way across more than a handful of schools at any one time.

Such a finding suggests, as does that by MacBeath (1999), that for every school that improves under a particular reform measure, it is likely that there will be others that fail to improve, or worse, go backwards. Certainly the evidence emerging from the Chicago research (Bryk, 1998) indicates that this is so.

Trying to explain why this might be the case becomes the critical issue. Reynolds (1994) suggests that it may have more to do with the practicalities of implementing reform than the theory of it:

> Superimposing on schools a range of responsibilities such as managing teacher appraisal, starting school development planning and running ambitious improvement programmes is likely to result in the raising of the educational ceiling by competent persons in competent schools but is also likely to result in the floor of incompetence being left increasingly far behind.
>
> (Reynolds, 1994: 17)

The Reynolds quotation suggests that there is more to it than School self-management simply being a good idea. We cannot ignore the fact that such critical factors in implementing reform as leadership, capability, motivation and resources are not equally distributed across whole education systems. Given this, it would be expected that some schools would profit more from self-management than others.

The implication of the international research is that the argument that school self-management improves student outcomes relies at best upon opinions rather than hard evidence of causality, and that even opinions are split between the positive and the negative. On this evidence, the case for the positive effect of self-management on learning quality is nowhere near proven.

The impact of the choice of school on school performance

However, perhaps we need to look at the other dominant feature of school reform in the 1990s, that of using market forces as a means of school development. Under such a system the parent has absolute choice as to which school to send their child. Under this view of the world, the very fact that schools are placed in competition with each other will generate the desire for positive change. In many of the western countries that have embraced self-management, the market and choice has been used as the strategy for improvement.

This seems to be a perfectly logical move to make. Parents should be able to choose the school that provides the best possible education for their children and schools should, in turn, respond to the needs identified by both parents and children. Yet it might be here that the difficulties facing self-managing schools might lie. The international evidence suggests that the use of choice actually increases diversity in student outcomes rather than raising the quality of education for all students.

Gilborn and Youdell (1998: 1) argued: 'There is strong evidence to suggest that local school choice markets operate in ways that reflect and maintain existing social class differences.' In Grant Maintained Schools, which were proposed to allow parents who sent their children to poorer schools to escape the clutches of the 'looney left' education authorities (Barber, 1996: 55) it was found that schools from the more well off areas that chose to become Grant Maintained.

Recent research into school choice presented by Richard Elmore from Harvard at the 1996 American Education Research Association conference in New York found that 'parents participating in choice programs in Detroit, Milwaukee, St Louis, San Antonio and Montgomery County, Md, are better educated, have higher achieving children and are more involved in their youngsters' schooling than parents whose children remain behind in neighbourhood schools' (Henry: 1996:1). This provides an indication that choice may help to increase the gap between those parents able to make appropriate choices and those parents, who because of their own previous educational disadvantage make the wrong choice, or who fail to choose at all.

Ritter (1998: 1-2) provides another example of how social class provides differential education for students when he compares two Californian schools; Ross, where the median home price is $750,000 and where 'almost 40% of the schools' $2.6 million budget comes from fund-raisers, parent donations and a special tax the town of 2,200 levies on itself, and Wilmington Park, where household income is less than $10,000 and where 'the year's big fund-raiser, a spring candy sale, netted about $5,000.' He argues 'parents who could afford $10,000 a year private school recognise that they have a good deal at Ross. They're giving less than that to a [school support] foundation, and it is tax-deductible. Private school fees isn't. Plus they get all the benefits of a neighborhood school, a sense of community.'

There is similar evidence in New Zealand, where Watson et al (1997: 102) found that:

> Local schools were consistently populated by students whose families had lower SES than others in their neighbourhoods. In contrast students who attended adjacent or distant schools were from families which had relatively high SES in comparison with their neighbourhoods...
>
> ...it was the *relatively well-off* students who attended adjacent schools after 1991; those *relatively worse off* were most likely to go to their local school.

They concluded 'it is our belief that competition has not brought about, and will not bring about, social justice. In many cases it has only served to increase educational and ultimately social inequalities' (Watson et al, 1997: 108).

Even in Africa, where the post-apartheid government introduced choice as a means of improving the system, *The Sunday Times* reports (Garson 1998: 12) that:

> ...flight is reaching epic proportions. Panic hovers over the public school sector as pupil numbers fluctuate wildly in tandem with parental neurosis.
>
> There is a knock-on effect throughout the public school sector. Township children are vacating their local schools for better-resourced former Indian, coloured and white suburban schools far away. And while many township schools stand half-empty, others are filling up rapidly with children from informal settlements.
>
> Meanwhile, children living in the suburbs and metropolitan areas are fleeing state and well-resourced former Model C schools, opting for private education.

Perhaps the deficiency in the system of choice employed by many governments internationally is twofold. First, not all parents are equally capable of making choices based on quality (because their own education did not provide them with sufficient knowledge to distinguish a poor education from a good one) or, increasingly, are not able to afford the cost of implementing their preferred choice. For instance, in the above example, it is highly unlikely that anyone from the Wilmington Park school could afford to send their child to Ross school, even if they decided their child would have a better education at Ross.

Second, the issue is based upon choice of quality rather than choice of options. By employing the self-managing school concept, governments have asked schools to try and improve themselves rather than making sure that the base level of education is of a high standard regardless of the school attended. With so many requirements (in terms of curriculum and accountability) heaped upon the school, only those schools with ample resources have the time, money and energy to go beyond the regular program. Schools with students who are historically less well off, with parents who mostly can't or won't be involved, either financially or educationally, spend most of the time trying to overcome the difficulties students face in basic skills.

It is the school's responsibility to do the best for its students, but it is the system's responsibility to ensure that every school is at the qualitative level that is required. Many years passed before schools systems got around to addressing this deficiency. The cry 'lives are at stake' is now being used to justify new levels of intervention and accountability, but how many lives were lost while governments sat back with the expectation that the theory would work in practice?

However, the reform movement of the last decade has generated a debate about what education should be and how it should be provided at a level never considered before. What the debate has done is to bring to centre stage how schools need to be different from what they are now, and in doing so has helped to identify how little, in some ways, schools have changed since they were first created.

Second Millennium and Third Millennium Thinking about Education

It could be argued that, within this changing view of education, that many schools still have characteristics that reflect ways of thinking from a less hectic time, where technology took decades rather than months to move from one level to the next, where society had the time and resources to provide a range of community services (health, education, welfare) at little or no cost to the recipient and where the same curriculum could go on for years before a change was needed. Hood (1998: 3) argued that:

> Structurally the curriculum is much the same as it has been for the last 50 years, as is how teachers approach the curriculum. Students are still divided into classes of about the same number, primarily based on age. The day is rigidly fixed within specific timeframes and divided by inflexible timetables. Teachers teach subjects, and front up each hour to a different group of

students. Classrooms are designed and used as they were 50 years ago, even though the décor might have changed. Assessment of learning is still dominated by national external examinations.

It is quite clear that the reform activity over the past few years, together with other social changes involving technology, the economy and employment have led to new ways of thinking about education. We now accept the concept of lifelong learning; we now understand that school is only one avenue to an education; we now recognise the impact that technology has had on ways of learning, and so on. Townsend, Clarke and Ainscow (1999) suggest that this might be characterised as moving from second millennium thinking to third millennium thinking about education. Some of the changing ways of addressing education are listed below:

Second Millennium Thinking	Third Millennium Thinking
Important learning can only occur in formal learning facilities.	People can learn things from many sources.
Everyone must learn a common 'core' of content.	Everyone must understand the learning process and have basic learning skills.
The learning process is controlled by the teacher. What is to be taught, when it should be taught and how it should be taught should all be determined by a professional person.	The learning process is controlled by the learner. What is to be taught, when it should be taught and how it should be taught will all be determined by the learner.
Education and learning are individual activities. Success is based on how well learners learn as individuals.	Education and learning are highly interactive activities. Success is based on how well learners work together as a team.
Formal education prepares people for life.	Formal education is the basis for lifelong learning.
The terms 'education' and 'school' mean almost the same thing.	'School' is only one of a multitude of steps in the education journey.
Once you leave formal education, you enter the 'real world'.	Formal education provides a range of interactions between learners and the world of business, commerce and politics.
The more formal qualifications you have the more successful you will be.	The more capability and adaptability you have the more successful you will be.
Basic education is funded by government.	Basic education is funded by both government and private sources.

(From Townsend, Clarke and Ainscow, 1999: 363)

We might suggest that schools and school systems that are governed by the structures of the past might be considered as second millennium schools. However, some people, and some schools, are addressing the need for change and this is shown by thinking about the task of schools and the way in which they service and fit within society (Townsend, Clarke and Ainscow (1999: 361-62).

Second Millennium Schools	Third Millennium Schools
Schools provide formal education programs which students must attend for a certain minimum amount of time.	People have access to learning 24 hours a day 365 days a year through a variety of sources, some of which will be schools.
Schools offer a broad range of curriculum to prepare students for many varied life situations.	Schools offer a narrow curriculum focusing on literacy, numeracy, and generic technological and vocational skills.
Teachers are employed to 'know'. The learner fits in with the teacher.	Teachers are employed to match teaching to the needs of the learner .
Schools are communities of learners, where individuals are helped to reach their potential.	Schools are learning communities where everyone (students, teachers, parents, administrators) is both a learner and a teacher, depending on the circumstances.
The information to be learned is graded in a specific way and is learned a particular order. Everyone gets a similar content, with only limited differentiation based on interest.	Information is accessed according to the learner's capability and interest. The information will vary greatly after basic skills are learned.
Schools are still much the same in form and function as they were when they were first developed.	Schools as we know them have been dramatically altered in form and function, or have been replaced.
Schools have limited, or no, interactions with those who will employ their students or the people from the community in which the school resides.	Communities will be responsible for the education of both students and adults. Business and industry will be actively involved in school developments.
Schools are successful if they fit their students into a range of possible futures from immediate employment as factory hands and unskilled workers to tertiary education for training as professionals.	Schools will only be successful if *all* students have the skills required to work within, and adapt to, a rapidly changing employment, social and economic climate.
Formal education institutions are protected from the 'market'.	Formal education institutions are subject to 'market' forces.

It is not likely to be the case that everybody will agree with the direction the trends as listed are moving. Some of them are controversial, such as the move from government funding of education to a mixture of government and private funding, and the move that sees the curriculum narrow its focus to skill based areas, but these might only be of concern if schools look the same in twenty years as they do now. But if we take a broader view of educational developments, then perhaps these concerns might be explained in due course.

It could be argued that some schools already have changed the way in which they operate, but that others are lagging behind. There is a continuum from schools that are still well and truly entrenched in second millennium thinking at one end, some that are already well advanced in terms of their third millennium thinking at the other end, and yet others somewhere in the middle as well. Where schools are is a reflection of the thinking of the people that are working within them. Different people have responded to ongoing educational change in different ways. Townsend (1997: 225) described this in the following way:

> People currently involved in restructuring efforts could be considered as analogous to the surfer catching a wave breaking on the shore. They might remember the time when the sea was smooth, but now are faced with all sorts of upheavals that a breaking wave brings. Some will catch the wave and pick up speed towards the future, others will be dumped, and yet others will miss the wave altogether and be relegated to the thoughts of the past.

Stoll and Fink (1996: 85) also consider the different starting points for schools on this journey when they identify schools on an effectiveness and improvement typology as moving, cruising, strolling, struggling or sinking. The moving school is most likely to show third millennium characteristics and the sinking school is one most likely to be stuck at the second millennium level. It is the moving schools that will flourish and the sinking schools that will disappear under the market and choice iteration of education, but it is turning sinking schools into moving schools that is the goal of third millennium thinking.

Towards the Third Millennium School

If we tabulate the changes that have happened in education over the second millennium, we can not only see a change of focus from individual students through local provision to national concerns, but we can also see that the effectiveness of public education has gone from being successful for only very few people to now being successful for most people. The next major shift also becomes obvious. If we look at the dominant trends in society these days, with technology, with the global economy, with electronic communication, it is obvious that the next major focus for education is the move from the national, where each country defines its own education goals and how it offers them to its students, to an

international or global focus, where issues that affect us all, literacy, health, the environment, welfare and wealth, are tackled at the global level.

Interestingly enough, to have a global focus, every person on the globe must have the skills and attitudes necessary to take us to the next level of development. Thus to really embrace a global perspective, we must again focus on the individual. The wheel has come a full circle, with the difference this time being that the scope now must be all people rather than just a few. Back in the 1970s the community education movement exhorted that we 'Think Globally and Act Locally', but it is now obvious that we can no longer take such a narrow focus. Perhaps the catchcry for Third Millennium Schools will be to 'Think and Act both Locally and Globally'.

Period	Focus of delivery	Those effectively educated
1000-1870 AD	individual	Few People
1870-1980AD	Local	Some people
1980-2000AD	National	Many People
From 2000AD	Global	All People

Despite the rapid changes that have occurred in education over the past decade, the focus of education must change once again. As far back as 1981 Minzey (1981) argued, that previous educational reform had been similar to rearranging the toys in the toy box, when what we really needed was a whole new box. This claim would still be true today.

Such a shift in both focus and scope will create interesting challenges for education and really demands that we look at new designs for schools. Beare (1997: 1) suggested that perhaps we might consider redesigning schools from the ground up, when he argued:

> If, as an educational planner, you were presented with a greenfields site on which a new town or suburb was to be built to accommodate dwellings for approximately 22,000 people, what schools or educational buildings would you offer the developer?

If we were 'to turn the clock back a little, to wonder what we might do if schools did not now currently exist' (Townsend, 1998: 246), Beare (1997: 2-4) argues there are some things that we would not have in our new design for schools, including:

- the egg-crate classrooms and long corridors;
- the notion of set class groups based on age-grade structures;
- the division of the school day into standard slabs of time;
- the linear curriculum parceled into step-by-step gradations;
- the parceling of human knowledge into pre-determined boxes called 'subjects';
- the division of staff by subject specialisation;
- the allocation of most school tasks to the person called 'teacher';
- the assumption that learning takes place in a place called 'school';
- the artificial walls that barricade school from home and community;

- the notion of a stand-alone school isolated from other schools;
- the notion of a school system bounded by a locality such as a state or even country;
- the limitation of 'formal schooling' to twelve years and between the ages of five and eighteen.

But we also need to consider a new charter for education, one that is global, but can be implemented locally in every community. The starting point for any charter is what it hopes to attain for people and perhaps the best starting point for this is to consider the skills and attitudes that we want in our communities in the Third Millennium. I would like to argue (from Townsend 1999: 15) that an education charter for the Third Millennium should be based upon four pillars:

- Education for Survival (once the whole curriculum, now the building block for everything else);
- Understanding our place in the world (how my own particular talents can be developed and used);
- Understanding Community (how I and others are connected); and
- Understanding our personal responsibility (understanding that being a member of the world community carries responsibilities as well as rights).

These four pillars join to create a new curriculum of Third Millennium Skills and Attitudes. Those listed below should be seen as a starting point rather than a defined list. They may change further as we get to know more about student learning and as the technologies create new skill demands:

Education for Survival
- Literacy and Numeracy
- Technological capability
- Communication Skills
- Development capability
- Entrepreneurship
- Critical Thinking Skills

Understanding our place in the world
- Work Experience
- Exchange of Ideas
- Awareness and Appreciation of cultures
- Vision and Open Mindedness
- Creative Capability
- Awareness of one's choices

Understanding Community
- Teamwork capability
- Citizenship studies
- Community Service

- Community Education
- Global Awareness and Education

Understanding our personal responsibility

- Commitment to personal growth through lifelong learning
- Commitment to community and global development
- Development of a personal value system
- Leadership capabilities
- Adaptability
- Commitment to personal and community health

Given the current difficulties that many western societies have in funding public education, like many other industries, education must work smarter rather than harder. Some of the key areas for Third Millennium Schools to focus upon would be:

To use technology rather than to compete with it

There is a tendency for teachers to see improvements in technology as a potential threat to their future employment, thus they sometimes resist using the technology and try to prove that they can do better themselves. However, the rapid escalation of knowledge and the level of technological sophistication now available suggests that no single person is able to know or do it all. Third Millennium teachers will need to review what their task is and how best to do it, using the knowledge base and technology at their disposal. This is one of the many changes to teacher culture that must happen sooner rather than later.

To develop collaborative learning, locally, nationally and globally

Since it is now possible to disseminate world's best practice for many different things internationally, we now must accept that the role of teacher and learner has been changed. The designated teacher will also need to be a learner and designated learners can also share a range of knowledge not currently available to teachers. With the learner in total control of what it is he or she will learn, teaching and learning becomes a collaborative exercise rather than a power relationship. With possible connections with other learners, teachers, schools and other learning facilities across states and across countries, the Third Millennium school will use the available resources in a different way. Teachers, learners and schools will all be partners in the exercise, sharing resources, knowledge and capabilities to ensure the best outcomes for everyone.

To refocus on the individual

For Third Millennium schools to claim success, every person that passes through them must achieve to the levels required by the state, the local community and themselves. Thus the dual focus of state mandated requirements must have added to them what is required locally. Townsend (1994) called this the 'core-plus curriculum' where the core areas are those identified by the state as being so important that every student must learn and know them and the plus areas are those identified by the local community as being important for their group of children. Further we must focus on ensuring that every student achieves within that framework.

If we then suggest that to properly focus on the individual students within the school we must also consider the educational needs of others in the local community we get to what Townsend (1994) called the 'core plus school' where the core activity of the school is the education of the children in its care and the plus activity is the development of programs and processes that will resolve the educational needs of the members of its community.

To accept, and teach for, more than one form of intelligence

Howard Gardner (1993) suggested that we should accept multiple forms of intelligence including linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal and Goleman (1995) talked about emotional intelligence as means of explaining the way various people operate successfully in the world. This work, together with the assets work of Benson and colleagues (1997) indicate quite clearly that the past priority focus on one form of intelligence (linguistic/logical-mathematical competence) has disenfranchised many of our students and has actively prevented them from achieving their personal best. Third Millennium schools will have accepted the range of other intelligences that make for whole human beings and will provide learning activities that promote them all.

To focus on process skills rather than specific content knowledge, to focus on higher order skills rather than facts

It is clear from the rapid development of new knowledge that we are no longer certain of what the key knowledge will be, even ten years in the future. One might look to the rise of economic and business knowledge and the decline of what might be considered classical knowledge as a case in point. This is not to suggest that some knowledge is better than others, but it does suggest that at certain times in history, some is more valued by the dominant sections of society. Consequently, the key skills in the future will relate to the ability to access knowledge rather than having specific knowledge. The Third Millennium school will use current content as a means of explaining the process aspects of acquiring and using knowledge, but the expectations will be that after students have finished school they will be able to determine for themselves which knowledge is most valuable to them and have the skill to seek it out and acquire it. Such skills would include literacy and numeracy as a matter of course, but would then include skills related to analysis, thinking, weighing evidence and decision-making as being first order tasks.

To accept, and teach for, lifelong learning

Given everything that has been said above, the underlying assumption is that we will never be in a position to know everything that we need to know. Thus it is critical to develop a positive attitude towards ongoing learning throughout one's life. Teachers and parents both have a role to model this attitude and will do so in Third Millennium schools that have strong, viable and consistent professional development and adult learning programs operating. The promotion of the core-plus school will enable communities to work with schools in the determination of the programs that will assist the community as a whole to meet its needs. In return whole communities, rather than just teachers, parents and students, will see the school as a vital part of their continuing development as adults. In these circumstances, community support for their local school, both financially and in terms of volunteer involvement should be assured.

To develop learning communities rather than communities of learners
Although the focus of much of the work of Third Millennium schools will be on the development of every individual, it will happen in an environment that inspires co-operation rather than competition. Rather than assuming that the task of education is to fit people into society it becomes one of improving human potential. Recently, the argument has been made that people should be made more literate and numerate so that the country would be more economically viable, but not so long ago we argued that people should be literate and numerate because it made them more human. The Third Millennium school will recognise that only people who have recognised their potential and have the skills to realise that potential can contribute to the development of local, national and global communities. Since learning best occurs when we are working with others, the Third Millennium school will be one that seeks to have students, parents, teachers and community members all actively contributing to the life of the school and the life of its community and the community of the school as a whole contributing to the life of other schools and other communities.

The Challenge

The move from Second Millennium to Third Millennium schools will involve many changes. Public and private schools will become comrades rather than competitors, supporting each other to promote the goal of education for all. No single school will be able to offer the entire curriculum, so schools will work together to enable all needs to be addressed. Principals will need to reclaim their role as educational leaders of communities, rather than being seen as line managers for school systems. Teachers will need to develop their role as learning facilitators for whole communities, not just for children. Students will need to see school as the first step in a lifelong journey, rather than something that needs to be endured then forgotten. The community as a whole will need to both support public education and be a client of it. It will recognise that money spent on education is saved many times over as unemployment, drugs, crime and welfare support decrease. Perhaps most of all, governments will need to review their position that schools are independent units that can exist in isolation from other schools. Co-operation will replace competition as the underlying principle for both public and private education.

As I have said elsewhere (Townsend, 1998: 248):

> In my view the best education that we can hope for, for our students, for our families and for Australia is one that is local (ie. in my community) and global (i.e. provides access to the knowledge resources of the whole world). It is grounded in the community in which I live but opens up a world of possibilities. It is educative and it is social. It provides me with the skills that I need now and gives me access to those that I will need later. I am linked to my education at all times of the day and no matter where I am in the world. My school age

children, the rest of my family, my neighbours and my friends can all participate with me. We would want the best school to be my local school. In short, this new institution has become a community facility which is sometimes used for the education of children and has replaced the school which was not a community facility, but was only sometimes used for the education of children.

The town of Independence, Missouri has as its catchphrase 'You don't have to move to live in a better community'. The Third Millennium school may well borrow it as it moves into the future... 'You don't have to move to go to a better school...but you do have to do something'.

References

Arnott, M, Bullock, A & Thomas, H (1992) 'Consequences of Local Management: An assessment by Head Teachers'. Paper presented to the ERA Research Network, February 12.

Barber, M. (1996) *The Learning Game*, London: Victor Gollanncz.

Beare, H. (1997) 'Designing a break-the-mould school for the future'. A paper presented at the virtual conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration, Hawthorn

Benson, P.L., Leffert, N., Scales, P.C. and Blyth, D.A. (1988) 'Beyond the "Village" Rhetoric: Creating Healthy Communities for Children and Adolescents' in *Applied Developmental Science, 2* (3), pp 138-159

Bryk, A. (1998) 'Chicago School Reform: Linkages between local control, educational supports and student achievement' A presentation at a symposium on the Chicago Schools Reform at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Diego, April.

Bullock, A & Thomas, H (1994) The impact of local management of schools: Final report, Birmingham, University of Birmingham.

Bullock, A & Thomas, H (1997) *Schools at the Centre: A Study of Decentralisation*, London: Routledge.

Caldwell, B. (1993) *Decentralising the Management of Australia's Schools*, Melbourne, Australia, National Industry Education Foundation.

Caldwell, B. (1998) *Self-Managing Schools and Improved Learning Outcomes*, Canberra, Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs

Codding, J. (1997) 'Designing Highly Effective Programs for Successful Schools'. A keynote presentation at the *Successful Schools* Conference, Melbourne, June 3.

Colvin, R. (1997) 'Reading Mecca faces a crisis' The Age 27 May, p 11.

Directorate of School Education (1993) School Charters Information Package for Consultation and Promotion. DSE: Melbourne.

Elmore, R.F. (1993) 'Why restructuring won't improve teaching.' *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 44-48.

Gardner, H. (1993) *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*, New York, Basic Books

Garson, P. (1998) 'Bussing to disaster' The Sunday Times (Johannesburg) September 6, p 12.
Gilborn, D. & Youdell, D. (1998) Raising Standards & Deepening Inequality: Selection, Leagues Tables and Reform in Multiethnic Secondary Schools. A paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Educational research Association, San Diego.
Goleman, D. (1995) *Emotional Intelligence*, New York, Bantam Books.
Henry, T (1996) 'Are school tax vouchers worthwhile?' USA Today April 11, 1.
Hill, P. & Crevola, C. (1997) 'Redesigning Schools for Improved Learning'. A presentation at the Successful Schools Conference, Melbourne, June 3.
Hood, D. (1998) *Our Secondary Schools don't work anymore*, Auckland, Profile Books
Lauder, H and Hughes, D (1990), 'Social Inequalities and Differences in School Outcomes', New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 25(1), 37-60.
MacBeath, J. (1999) 'Visiting the secret gardens: The Scottish system' in Townsend, T., Clarke, P. and Ainscow, M. *Third Millennium Schools: A World of Difference in Effectiveness and Improvement*, Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.
Malen, B, Ogawa, R.T. and Kranz, J. (1990) 'What do we know about site-based management: A case study of the literature -- A call for research' in Clune, w. and Witte, J. (Eds) *Choice and Control in American Education Volume 2: The Practice of Choice, Decentralisation and School Restructuring*, London, Falmer Press.
Martin, Hans-Peter and Schumann, Harald (1997) *The Global Trap: An Attack on Democracy and Prosperity*, London: Zed Books.
Minzey, J.D. (1981) Community Education and Community Schools. An address at the State College of Victoria, Frankston, Australia.
Newmann, F.M. and Wehlage, G.G. (1995) *Successful School Restructuring: A Report to the Public and Educators by the Center on Organisational Restructuring of Schools*, Madison, Wisc, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.
Olson, L. (1997) 'Shaking things up', *Education Week*, September, 10, 29-31.
Phillips, V. (1997) 'The role of accountability in student achievement' paper presented to the Doctor of Education program in Educational Leadership and Management, Schools of management Lincoln University, September.
Ramsay, P., Sneddon, D. G., Grenfell, J. and Ford, I. (1983) 'Successful and Unsuccessful Schools: A study in South Auckland' in *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 19* (2), 272-304.
Reynolds, D. (1994) The Effective School. A revised version of an Inaugural Lecture. University of Newcastle upon Tyne, October.
Ritter, J. (1998) 'Private Money pays for more than basics at public schools' *USA Today* April 13, pp 1-2
Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996) *Changing our Schools* London, Open University press
Summers, A. & Johnson, A. (1996) 'The effects of school-based management plans' in Hanushek, E. and Jorgenson, D. (eds) *Improving America's Schools: The Role of Incentives*, Washington, DC.
Thrupp, M. (1996), The Education Review Office and South Auckland Schools: A case of Ideology and Analysis? New Zealand Annual Review of Education 6, 51-70.
Thrupp, M. (1997), 'School mix and the outcomes of Educational Quasi-Markets' in Education Policy in New Zealand: the 1990's and beyond Mark Olssen and Kay

Morris Mathews (eds). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press, 372-390.
Toffler, A. (1970) *Future Shock*, London, Pan.
Townsend, T. (1994) *Effective Schooling for the Community: Core Plus Education*, London and New York, Routledge.
Townsend, T. (1997) *Restructuring and Quality: Issues for Tomorrow's Schools*, London and New York, Routledge.
Townsend, T. (1998)*The Primary School in Changing Times: The Australian Experience*, London and New York: Routledge.
Townsend, T. (1999) *The Third Millennium School: Towards a Quality Education for All Students.* Incorporated Association of Registered Teachers of Victoria, Melbourne.
Townsend, T., Clarke, P. and Ainscow, M. (1999) 'Third Millennium Schools: prospects and problems for school effectiveness and school improvement' in Townsend, T., Clarke, P. and Ainscow, M. *Third Millennium Schools: A World of Difference in Effectiveness and Improvement*, Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.
Watson, S. Hughes, D. Lauder, H, Strathdee, R and Simiyu, I (1997) 'Ethnicity and school choice' in *Education Policy in New Zealand: the 1990's and Beyond* Mark Olssen and Kay Morris Mathews (eds). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press, 95-109.
Whitty, G. (1994) *Devolution in Education Systems: Implications for Teacher Professionalism and Pupil Performance.* A discussion paper. Melbourne, Australia, National Industry Education Foundation.
Wylie, C. (1997) *Self Managing Schools Seven Years On: What have we Learnt?* Wellington, NZCER.

EA 030145

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: From Second to Third Millennium Schools: The Impact of the reform agenda on school development.	
Author(s): Tony Townsend	
Corporate Source: Monash University / Australia AERA Conference Montreal 1999	Publication Date: April 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: AC Townsend	Printed Name/Position/Title: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EDUCATION
Organization/Address: MONASH UNIVERSITY PO BOX 527 FRANKSTON VIC 3199 AUSTRALIA	Telephone: 613-9904 4230 FAX: 613-9904 4237
	E-Mail Address: tony.townsend@education.monash.edu.au Date: 4 NOV 99

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com